

Notice of Allowability	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/079,679	THAXTON, DAN	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	SHAHID KAMAL	3718	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address--

All claims being allowable, PROSECUTION ON THE MERITS IS (OR REMAINS) CLOSED in this application. If not included herewith (or previously mailed), a Notice of Allowance (PTO-85) or other appropriate communication will be mailed in due course. **THIS NOTICE OF ALLOWABILITY IS NOT A GRANT OF PATENT RIGHTS.** This application is subject to withdrawal from issue at the initiative of the Office or upon petition by the applicant. See 37 CFR 1.313 and MPEP 1308.

1. This communication is responsive to 12/14/2010 (Telecommunication).
2. The allowed claim(s) is/are 1-20.
3. Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All
 - b) Some*
 - c) None
 of the:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* Certified copies not received: _____.

Applicant has THREE MONTHS FROM THE "MAILING DATE" of this communication to file a reply complying with the requirements noted below. Failure to timely comply will result in ABANDONMENT of this application.
THIS THREE-MONTH PERIOD IS NOT EXTENDABLE.

4. A SUBSTITUTE OATH OR DECLARATION must be submitted. Note the attached EXAMINER'S AMENDMENT or NOTICE OF INFORMAL PATENT APPLICATION (PTO-152) which gives reason(s) why the oath or declaration is deficient.
5. CORRECTED DRAWINGS (as "replacement sheets") must be submitted.
 - (a) including changes required by the Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) attached
 - 1) hereto or 2) to Paper No./Mail Date _____.
 - (b) including changes required by the attached Examiner's Amendment / Comment or in the Office action of Paper No./Mail Date _____.

Identifying indicia such as the application number (see 37 CFR 1.84(c)) should be written on the drawings in the front (not the back) of each sheet. Replacement sheet(s) should be labeled as such in the header according to 37 CFR 1.121(d).
6. DEPOSIT OF and/or INFORMATION about the deposit of BIOLOGICAL MATERIAL must be submitted. Note the attached Examiner's comment regarding REQUIREMENT FOR THE DEPOSIT OF BIOLOGICAL MATERIAL.

Attachment(s)

1. Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2. Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3. Information Disclosure Statements (PTO/SB/08),
Paper No./Mail Date _____
4. Examiner's Comment Regarding Requirement for Deposit
of Biological Material
5. Notice of Informal Patent Application
6. Interview Summary (PTO-413),
Paper No./Mail Date Attached.
7. Examiner's Amendment/Comment
8. Examiner's Statement of Reasons for Allowance
9. Other _____.

/Pierre E. Elisca/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3718

DETAILED ACTION

Acknowledgements

1. This communication is in response to claims amendment filed on June 24, 2008 and further in response to the telecommunications with Applicant's representative, James F. Gottman (Registration No. 27,262) on December 14, 2010 ("Telephonic Interview").
2. Accordingly, claims 1-20 remain pending and have been allowed.

Examiner's Amendment

3. An Examiner's amendment to the record appears below. Should the changes and/or additions by unacceptable to applicant, an amendment may be filed as provided by 37 C.F.R. §1.312. To ensure consideration of such amendment, it must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee.
4. Authorization for this Examiner's amendment was given in a telephonic communication with James F. Gottman (Registration No. 27,262) on or about December 14, 2010.
5. The application has been amended as follows:

Listing of Claims

1. (Currently amended) A computer implemented method for evaluating document security features that provide a level of security in a security document, said security features being provided directly on said security document, and rating the security level of said security document, comprising:

processing data relating to selected security features of said document using a computer, said security features each having associated compatibility and relative rating information;

determining compatibility issues using the computer among said selected security features of said document;

revising said selected security features of said document using said computer to resolve any compatibility issues;

evaluating said relative rating information of said selected security features using said computer to determine a document security rating of said document; and

presenting said document security rating of said document on a display of said computer.

2. (Previously presented) The method of claim 1, further comprising presenting security features on a display of the computer for selection.

3. (Original) The method of claim 2, wherein said security features are presented categorized by purpose.

4. (Original) The method of claim 2, further comprising providing a selectable link for at least one said security feature, which when selected presents information which describes the associated security feature and explains strengths and weaknesses of the associated security feature.

5. (Original) The method of claim 1, further comprising recommending said security features based on security document type and desired security level.

6. (Previously presented) The method of claim 5, further comprising providing a link for at least one of said security document type, which when selected presents an example of the associated security document type.

7. (Previously presented) The method of claim 6, wherein said example includes recommended security features and providing associated links which when selected explain each associated security feature.

8. (Original) The method of claim 1, further comprising requesting document design information to help assess compatibility issues.

Art Unit: 3718

9. (Original) The method of claim 8, wherein said document design information includes use of security document, type of document paper, storage requirements, printer type, threat environment assessment, type of document tracking, type of document authentication, and type of document shipping.

10. (Previously presented) The method of claim 8, wherein certain said security features are made unselectable by said computer based said document design information.

11. (Original) The method of claim 1, wherein said document security rating includes a rating of how well said selected security features will protect the security document against different forms of attack and relative ease of authentication of the security document.

12. (Original) The method of claim 11, wherein said different forms of attack include tampering, copying, counterfeiting, and accessing, and said rating is provided for each attack type.

13. (Original) The method of claim 11, wherein said authentication includes overt, covert, and mechanical, and said rating is provided for each authentication type.

14. (Previously presented) The method of claim 1, wherein revising said selected security features of said document using said computer to resolve any compatibility issues comprises the steps of providing a warning with said computer, and suggesting at least two possible solutions with said computer for resolving said compatibility issue.

15. (Original) The method of claim 1, further comprising viewing a relative cost assessment for selected features.

16. (Original) The method of claim 1, further comprising presenting a link to common questions and concerns.

17. (Previously presented) The method of claim 1, wherein said data relating to said selected security features is obtained from a database by said computer.

18. (Original) The method of claim 12, further comprising providing a protection disclaimer if said rating for at least one said attack type is deficient, and providing security feature suggestions that will provide the security document with adequate protection and performance in the specified attack type area.

19. (Original) The method of claim 13, further comprising providing a protection disclaimer if said rating for at least one said authentication type is deficient, and providing security feature suggestions that will provide the security document with adequate protection and performance in the specified authentication type area.

20. (Currently amended) A non-transitory computer-readable medium with an executable program thereon, wherein the program instructs a processor of a computer system to perform evaluation of document security features that provide a level of security in a security document, said security features being provided directly on said security document, and rating the security level of said security document, the evaluation being carried out by the steps of:

processing data relating to selected security features of said document using said computer system, said security features each having associated compatibility and relative rating information;

determining compatibility issues using said computer system among said selected security features of said document; and

evaluating said relative rating information of said selected security features using said computer system to determine a document security rating of said document; and

presenting said document security rating of said document on a display of said computer system.

Reasons for Allowance

6. The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance:

7. Regarding the claimed terms, the Examiner notes that a “general term must be understood in the context in which the inventor presents it.” In re Glaug 283 F.3d 1335, 1340, 62 USPQ2d 1151, 1154 (Fed. Cir. 2002). Therefore the Examiner must interpret the claimed terms as found on pages 1-23 of the specification. Clearly almost all the general terms in the claims may have multiple meanings. So where a claim term “is susceptible to various meanings, . . . the

inventor's lexicography must prevail" Id. Using these definitions for the claims, the claimed invention was not reasonably found in the prior art.

8. This application is regarding a computer-based process for product selection optimization by displaying various security features available for a security document, for evaluating the impact that the selection of one security feature has upon the selection of other features, and for optimizing the selection of each security feature or a combination of features in meeting a protection goal for the security document.

9. The closest prior art is by Townsend (US Patent No. 6,631,473 B2). Townsend teaches processing data relating to selected security features of said document using a computer; revising said selected security features of said document using said computer to resolve any issues; evaluating said relative rating information of said selected security features using said computer to determine a document security rating of said document; and presenting said document security rating of said document on a display of said computer.

10. The second closest prior art is by Rhoads (US Pub. No. 2002/0080996 A1). Rhoads teaches that determining compatibility issues using the computer among said selected security features of said document.

Art Unit: 3718

11. However, the Townsend/Rhoads combination fails to teach the aspect of “said security features each having associated compatibility and relative rating information, determining compatibility issues using the computer among said selected security features of said document”.

12. Yet even if the missing claimed elements were found in a reasonable number of references, a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would not have been motivated to include these missing elements in an embodiment in Thaxton disclosure because: all of the above mention reference is directed toward for a method of selecting a security model for an organization operating an application on the computer network.

13. Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled “Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance.”

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shahid Kamal whose telephone number is (571) 270-3272. The Examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thursday 8:30 AM- 7:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner’s supervisor, Peter Vo can be reached on (571) 272-4690. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3718

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Shahid Kamal/
Examiner, Art Unit 3718

/Pierre E. Elisca/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3718